

Applicant's invention as set forth in Claim 1 relates to an image display system capable of performing stereoscopic display. The system includes stereoscopic image display means for displaying a stereoscopic image having stripe parallax images arranged for right and left eyes, wherein the stripe parallax images arranged for the right eye are displayed on first stripe areas of first display means, and the stripe parallax images arranged for the left eye are displayed on second stripe areas of the first display means, and window setting means for setting a single window on a desired position of the first display means, in which a stereoscopic image comprised of stripe parallax images arranged for the right and left eyes is displayed. In addition, stereoscopic vision control means displays a parallax barrier pattern on second display means such that stripe parallax images of the stereoscopic image displayed on the first and second stripe areas of the first display means are respectively observed with the right and left eyes, and changing means changes, when the stripe parallax images arranged for the right and left eyes to be displayed in the single window are displayed on the second and first stripe areas respectively, the display position of the single window so as to display, on the first and second stripe areas in the single window respectively, the stripe parallax images arranged to the right eye and left eye without change of the parallax barrier pattern.

In accordance with Claim 1, Applicant provides an image display system that provides superior display of three dimensional images.

As discussed in the previous Amendment of July 14, 2004, the primary citation to Isono relates to a three dimensional display apparatus that includes an image barrier 46 having a barrier display panel 28 as the stereoscopic vision control means. The Office Action asserts that Isono discloses the shifting of a parallax barrier to the left or the right, but acknowledges that there is no disclosure of specifically shifting the stripe parallax images so that the stripe parallax

images arranged for the right eye and left eye are displayed in the first and second areas, respectively. The secondary citation to Tabata is cited to compensate for this deficiency.

Tabata relates to a stereoscopic video display in which left and right images can be shifted in order to provide a proper stereoscopic image. It is respectfully submitted, however, that Tabata does not display stripe parallax images, but rather merely displays images for left and right eyes on a left eye LCD (liquid crystal display device) 11L and a right eye LCD 11R, respectively.

As understood, in Tabata's stereoscopic video display, an image on the left eye LCD is always observed by the left eye, and an image on the right eye LCD is always observed by the right eye, and Tabata shifts the images so that a distance of convergence become substantially equal to a viewing distance. In contrast to Claim 1, therefore, Tabata is not capable of changing the display position of the single window so as to display, on the first and second stripe areas in the single window respectively, the stripe parallax images arranged for the right and left eyes without changing the parallax barrier pattern. It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that Tabata fails to compensate for the deficiencies in Isono in this regard.

The tertiary citation to Drinkwater relates to a holographic security device and was cited for allegedly teaching that images can be displayed so the viewer sees no change in parallax patterns despite parallax changes. It is respectfully submitted, however, that Drinkwater relates to a hologram that uses moire patterns, but does not display a parallax barrier pattern. As understood, Drinkwater provides merely that as a viewer changes parallax looking at different viewing positions in the hologram, the viewer sees no change in the relative positions of the patterns vertically (see column 2, lines 36-39). It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that it

would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the display apparatus in Isono in view of Drinkwater as asserted in the Office Action.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination of Isono, Tabata and Drinkwater cannot be used to render obvious Applicant's invention as set forth in Claim 1.

Claim 45 is similar in scope to Claim 1, but sets forth that the display position of the stripe parallax images arranged for the right and left eyes in the single window is changed. For at least the same reasons as discussed above, Claim 45 is submitted to be patentable over the cited art.

In Claim 34, a method of controlling an information display system having stereoscopic image display means includes the step of changing, when stripe parallax images arranged for the right and left eyes to be displayed in a single window are displayed on the second and first stripe areas respectively, the display position of the single window, so as to display, on the first and second stripe areas respectively, the stripe parallax images arranged for the right and left eyes without change of the parallax barrier pattern. Therefore, for at least the same reasons as discussed above, Claim 34 is also submitted to be patentable over the cited art.

In Claims 36, 37 and 41, an adjustment is made, when it is determined that a stereoscopic image displayed in a single window and a parallax barrier pattern are not in a proper positional relationship, by shifting the stripe parallax images so that the stripe parallax images arranged for the right and left eyes are displayed in first and second areas, respectively, without change of the parallax barrier pattern. For at least the reasons discussed above therefore, Claims 36, 37 and 41 are also submitted to be patentable over the cited art.


Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

Thus, it is submitted that Applicant's invention as set forth in independent Claims 1, 34, 36, 37, 41 and 45 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 3-10, 15-17, 38-40, 42-44 and 46-48 set forth additional features of Applicant's invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
Scott D. Malpede
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SDM\mm

DC_MAIN 199470v1